THE Nation

VOLUME 147 NEW YORK • SATURDAY • JULY 30, 1938 NUMBER 5

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 97

EDITORIALS:

HITLER'S PROPOSALS 99

POLITICS AND HEALTH 100

AFTER THIRTY YEARS 101

WHERE MURDER IS OVERLOOKED
by Paul Y. Anderson 102

SPAIN'S TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY
by Louis Fischer 103

THE BILLION-DOLLAR POOLROOM RACKET
by F. B. Warren 106

IN THE WIND 109

ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 110

BOOKS AND THE ARTS:

M. SYLVESTRE by Louis Kronenberger 111

THE HIDDEN STREAM by Louise Bogan 111

TRIALS ON TRIAL by Reinhold Niebuhr 112

POLITICAL ALMANAC by Eliot Janeway 113

RADIO RULES THE WAVES by N. R. Danielian 114

SEA GOING by Hugh H. Darby 115

Editors
FREDA KIRCHWEY MAX LERNER

Managing Editor
M. R. BENDINER

Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editor MAXWELL S. STEWART

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

✶

Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MURIEL C. GRAY

The Shape of Things

✶

LET IT NOT BE FORGOTTEN IN DAYS TO come: Maury Maverick, our most useful Congressman, was beaten in his fight for renomination by a corrupt and reactionary city machine and the American Federation of Labor. Paul Anderson has sent us a story that bears on Maverick's defeat. A few days before Congress recessed Maverick went to William Green and asked whether it was true that the A. F. of L. intended to oppose him. Green said, yes. Maverick asked whether he had ever cast one vote of which Green disapproved. Green said, no, his record was perfect from the A. F. of L. point of view. Maverick said, "In the face of that record you intend to oppose me simply because I have expressed sympathy with the aims of the C. I. O.?" Green said yes, it was a fight to the death and no exceptions would be made regardless of who Maverick's opponent might be. Maverick said, "That's all I want to hear from you—or about you." The New Deal was not openly an issue in the campaign, but Paul J. Kilday, who won by the narrow margin of 548 votes, charged his opponent with radicalism and a tenderness for the C. I. O. and urged amending the Wagner Act to provide a "fair, impartial, and judicial" labor relations board. It is a relief to turn to Montana and record the renomination of Congressman Jerry J. O'Connell in a fairly close fight. O'Connell has not the bold intelligence and dynamic force that characterize Maverick, but he is a valuable member of the small band of fighting liberals in the lower house.

✶

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UNITED Automobile Workers Union is proceeding, as we go to press, with the trial of Vice Presidents Frankensteen, Mortimer, Hall, and Wells on a collection of vague charges ranging from conspiracy to "bring about a state of chaos within the membership" to "open incitation and rebellion" against the authority of the union. The vice presidents in turn are campaigning for a special convention to unseat President Homer Martin. Inexperienced leadership, mushroom growth, and irrelevant differences

THE NATION, Published weekly at 20 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1897, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1938, by The Nation, Inc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over American foreign policy appear to be the principal ingredients of the stew in which the U. A. W. now finds itself—the whole concoction over-seasoned with personal ambition and the bitters of left-wing factional politics. From the struggle between the Unity and Progressive groups which all but tore the union apart it appears that issues only remotely connected with the union as such have been introduced and permitted to dwarf completely the real business of the U. A. W.; and, second, that the die-hard antagonism stems, at least in part, from the grim determination of the Communists and Lovestoneites in the union not only to oppose each other but to force each other's expulsion from the organization. It would be possible to expel adherents of both these parties, but such a course would be next to fatal for the democracy of the American labor movement. Neither should be suppressed, but on the contrary it must be made clear to each that the other should and will be tolerated. Obviously it will take someone above the present battle to do that. Martin is clearly an interested party and his actions in suspending the officers have been high-handed in the extreme. It is no testimonial to his good faith that he resists the possibility of arbitration proceedings conducted by John L. Lewis or one of his lieutenants—proceedings which saner elements of the union, led by Walter Reuther, earnestly request.

✶

WHEN THE UNITED STATES APPEALS TO Mexico in the name of "universally recognized rules of law and equity," as Secretary Hull does in his latest note, the invocation is likely to be greeted by a smile. One who seeks equity must come into court with clean hands, and those of the American interests below the Rio Grande are hardly immaculate. However, the note deals not with oil holdings but with moderate-sized farms taken by the Mexican government since 1927. The amount claimed, some $10,000,000, is not large; the owners involved, mostly small ranchers, are more likely to command sympathy than the great oil companies; the procedure outlined, arbitration under the 1929 Inter-American Treaty of Arbitration, is fair; the tone of the note, friendly. If the Administration's purpose is to placate those who have been demanding that it "do something" about the Cárdenas expropriations, the latest move is kind as well as shrewd. Mexico is offered the opportunity for an inexpensive beau geste. That the Mexican government will suspect an entering wedge for the claims of the oil companies is natural, and careful examination of the precedents that might flow from arbitration of these land claims would be wise. We hope the small rancher is not to play the role that the ubiquitous widows and orphans play in the propaganda of the power companies. A realistic appraisal of the situation dictates a settlement of some kind as soon as possible. But there is no reason why, in the case of the oil companies, the Mexico of Cárdenas should buy back at inflated valuations rights stolen in the Mexico of Diaz.

✶

JAPAN HAS INDICATED ITS WILLINGNESS TO adjust the "2,400 border conflicts" which, according to ex-Premier General Hayashi, have arisen since 1931 between Japan and the Soviet Union. Domei, the official Japanese news agency, announces that Tokyo will use the Changkufeng incident as the point of departure for a general review of its relations with the U. S. S. R., to culminate in a definite plan for at least a temporary appeasement. Japan undoubtedly created the Changkufeng incident to test the present strength and temper of the Soviet Union, as a year ago it tested them on the Amur. In 1937, doubtless for internal reasons, the Russian response was conciliatory; today it is firm, even defiant. There was little danger of a serious clash in any case; Japan knew that to risk a fight with its Russian adversary would have played right into China's hands. We say this without minimizing the importance of the Changkufeng incident. The hill which is in dispute is an important strategic spot. Besides being close to Vladivostok it is one of the few places on the coast line suitable for a submarine base. If the Japanese were to succeed in crowding the Russians out of this important location on the borderline between the Soviet Far East and Japan-controlled Manchukuo and Korea, Vladivostok would be in serious danger. Should Japan's adventure in China become even more hopeless than it is at present, it may well take a less important happening than the occupation of Changkufeng to touch off the long-awaited explosion on the Russian border.

✶

"PIX SLIPPING IN STIX" IS THE WAY THAT *Variety* heads a report on growing popular dissatisfaction with America's film diet. On the day this story appeared, the federal government filed an anti-trust suit against eight major film companies; the conditions unfolded in the government complaint help to explain why Hollywood has become so stagnant a wasteland and why its audience is becoming increasingly disconsolate. These eight companies are fundamentally one big family despite their highly publicized concern over who's got Robert Taylor. They do not merely control the production of 90 per cent of Hollywood's "quality" films; they have seized command of equally vast areas of the industry's exhibition machinery. Generously dividing up the nation's territory, they have each acquired large-scale theater holdings in which they respectively enjoy the privilege of displaying their own super-colossals. Through discriminatory film-rental arrangements they have succeeded in killing off most independent exhibitors;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through such devices as block-booking, a formula which compels the exhibitor to rent a group of mediocrities in return for one attractive offering, they have made life miserable for those independents who survive. The double feature is the monstrosity created by this union of the production and exhibition branches of the movies. Even if stripped of its theaters, the production fraternity may still wield suffocating power but this suit is an essential and vital beginning toward the emancipation of the films.

*

THERE IS PEACE IN THE CHACO AT LAST. After three years of mighty effort on the part of five leading South American countries and the United States, Paraguay and Bolivia have been persuaded to sign a treaty of peace and submit to arbitration their disputes over a piece of land the size of Arizona which cost the lives of 100,000 men in a war that raged for three years in swamp land not even fit for a battlefield. By the terms of the treaty, "Peace between the Republics of Paraguay and Bolivia is reestablished"; in subsequent arbitration the boundary line between the two countries is to be determined, within limits set in the treaty, by the Presidents of the republics of the Argentine, Chile, United States of America, United States of Brazil, Peru, and Uruguay. Though the treaty leaves Paraguay in possession of practically the entire Chaco area, Bolivia obtains an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean, receiving free port privileges at Port Casado, Paraguay's second most important port. But, as the newspaper report hastens to add, the principal value of Port Casado to Bolivians is psychological, because the Paraguay River is so far from Bolivian territory that it is not considered likely that there will be much Bolivian commerce through the new free port. Despite the intrinsic unimportance of the Chaco, the treaty is of primary importance because the quarrel had become a focus of dispute for all of South America, as well as a dangerous symbol. But while there is cause for rejoicing, the fact that so huge a mountain of persuasion should have had to labor so hard to bring forth the settlement is not exactly a hopeful commentary on the chance for peace in the greater quarrels of the day.

*

WE ARE HAPPY TO BE ABLE TO TELL OUR readers that *The Nation's* ambulance, purchased with funds which they contributed, is on its way to Spain. In response to two appeals for the required $1,000, readers responded generously and the issue was quickly oversubscribed by $200. In the face of the terrific battle which the Loyalists are putting up to keep Franco from Valencia one ambulance seems a small contribution, but there will be some Loyalist soldiers to whom it will make the difference between life and death.

Hitler's Proposals

THERE was no attempt to conceal the fact that the Paris visit of the King and Queen of England was politically highly significant or that Viscount Halifax, the British Foreign Secretary, held long secret conferences with Premier Daladier on a German proposal for the peaceable adjustment of the Czechoslovakian minorities question. It is known also that this proposal was originally laid before Prime Minister Chamberlain by Chancellor Hitler's personal adjutant, Captain Fritz Wiedemann, just before the British party left for France. Everything else is conjecture. As these lines are written, definite information on what Hitler really offered and how it was received in London, Paris, and Prague is still lacking.

Two versions of the proposals come from London. The first envisages a ten-year non-aggression pact between Berlin and Prague to be guaranteed by England, France, and the Soviet Union. As compensation, it is said, the Reich demands a substantial reduction in the numerical strength of Czechoslovakia's army, no extension of its period of military service, and the scrapping of the Czech "Maginot" line, a system of highly modern fortresses, recently built along the Czech-German border with generous financial assistance from Russia and France. Hitler made a similar offer to Czechoslovakia and Poland back in 1933. At that time Poland agreed, but Czechoslovakia declined to embark on a course that would have cost her the friendship of France. The mutual assistance pact with the Soviet Union was a later development.

The second version has it that Hitler is promoting a four-power pact—England, France, Germany, and Italy—on the basis of which German-Czech differences are to be adjusted. Both versions agree that Lord Halifax insisted on arbitration and that Daladier offered no serious objections. From still another source comes the story that Daladier's heated defense of Germany's proposals provoked a near-crisis in the French cabinet. The most emphatic protests, peculiarly, came from the conservative Paul Reynaud, Finance Minister, and from Communications Minister Georges Mandel, who belongs to the right wing of the Radical Socialist Party and first became known as the secretary of Georges Clemenceau. Edouard Herriot, president of the Chamber of Deputies, according to this report, also condemned the plan. Léon Blum, leader of the French Socialist Party, declared he would insist on a special session of the Chamber if the German offer were accepted. The compromise finally adopted was to all intents a rejection of the German proposal, since it accepted arbitration only on the condition that Czechoslovakia and Russia would be included in the discussions on a basis of complete equality. The majority held that four-power negotiations, with Berlin and Rome holding

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fort on one side and the strongly pro-German British Foreign Secretary in the middle, would isolate the French from the start.

The appointment of Viscount Runciman as a special "observer" at Prague may conceal dangers to Czechoslovakian independence but it assures at least a period of peaceful negotiations. Whatever the ultimate outcome of these negotiations, Hitler is checked for the time being, since aggressive action against Prague would force London to the side of France, with assistance from Italy more than doubtful.

Recent demonstrations of Anglo-French cooperation have had the effect of bringing Rumania and Jugoslavia, which for a time tended dangerously in the direction of the Rome-Berlin axis, back into the French fold. The Little Entente, wavering for several months between Rome and Paris, is showing signs of new life, and the Balkan Union, particularly Greece and Bulgaria, will think twice before it accepts the uncertain leadership of the fascist states now that Turkey has concluded its treaty with Great Britain. So for the present Berlin will have to be content to keep up friendly relations with England, knowing that they must include France as well. A putsch in Czechoslovakia is not nearly as certain as it seemed a few weeks ago. Berlin will continue to talk big, but it will do nothing deliberately to promote the consolidation of the growing understanding between the democratic and near-democratic countries.

Politics and Health

A GHOST walked through the proceedings of the National Health Conference at Washington last week, an unobtrusive specter that cast no shadow on the most notable event in the history of the American health movement. But no one could entirely forget its presence, and several mentioned it with respect. It was the ghost of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. Nine years ago that committee made public the results of a five-year study of medical needs and the ability of the people to pay for them. Its recommendations were moderate and sane. It advocated the development of voluntary, non-profit health centers and other agencies through which people of low income could get complete medical and hospital care for small fixed fees. The language of the report was circumspect. It avoided such provocative words as "socialized medicine," and only a small minority of the committee suggested that compulsory health insurance might eventually become necessary. But these modest recommendations became a storm center around which whirled the lightning and thunder of outraged medical opinion emanating chiefly from the American Medical Association. The embattled medical politicians, forming an almost solid phalanx behind Field Marshal Fishbein, attacked the proposals as communistic, disruptive of the standards, ethics, and self-government of the profession, and looking toward "state medicine."

During the deliberations which preceded the drafting of the Social Security Act in 1935 the question of compulsory health insurance was long debated. But when the bill was finally presented health was relegated to two "titles," under which provision was made for a limited federal-state program of health work. Nothing was said or done about health insurance, and everyone close to the social-security field knew why. The President decided not to risk the general purposes of the bill by engaging in an open fight with organized medicine. The need for unemployment insurance was overwhelmingly apparent, the demand for old-age assistance was emphasized by the clamor of the Townsendites. Many persons who knew how medical needs had multiplied during the depression years were disappointed by what seemed a shocking surrender. But perhaps the President was right. Health insurance—in this benighted country if nowhere else in the world—was still in the realm of social theory. It was supported by reformers and social workers. It had not yet become one of the conscious demands of great masses of people. Thus the American Medical Association was given another chance to prove that private medicine could cope with the growing needs of the country. Instead it has demonstrated the crucial necessity for state intervention.

The battalions of Dr. Fishbein have successfully trampled down every move toward reform in each annual convention of the A. M. A., and whenever a doctor has climbed out of the trenches to take part in even the most voluntary group enterprise they have used the sharp sword of excommunication to lop off his professional head. When some four hundred physicians of standing bravely demanded an open, democratic discussion within the A. M. A. of public needs and possible reforms they were met with hostility and contempt. As for the wind of public opinion, it has not even penetrated medical tradition.

Now organized medicine is going to reap the whirlwind. By opposing every effort at reform, from both within and without the profession, the A. M. A. has not only missed the chance of a century for leadership, but it has driven those who have assumed the lead to advocate more drastic measures. In Washington last week the government took command and gave a sounding board to the clearly expressed demands of the most important organized groups in the country—the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., the United Mine Workers and other great individual unions, the farm organizations, the fraternal societies, the women's clubs, and many more.

Almost without dissent they supported the major recommendations laid before the conference. These in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cluded a wide extension of the public-health services through increased federal participation, expansion of maternal and child-health work, expansion of hospital facilities, particularly in rural areas and for the treatment of special diseases, more adequate care of persons on relief and in the lower income groups. These rather detailed recommendations were supplemented by a proposal for a "general health program" for the entire population to be financed either by taxation or by "specific insurance contributions from the potential beneficiaries of an insurance system," while a separate recommendation was included providing for a system of insurance against loss of income during periods of sickness to be established along the lines of the present unemployment compensation.

The National Health Program will be a major issue during the next two years. No government would put such expert effort and the time and attention of more than half of its Cabinet officials into the development of such a program and then abandon it. No government would ask the support of such important sections of public opinion and then go back on them. As it stands, the program is hardly more than a working model; it will undoubtedly be subjected to a thorough overhauling. But nothing, we believe, can or should alter the basic purpose behind it—the development of a socially controlled, publicly financed system of medical care for the whole country. Organized medicine can help or hinder the necessary changes; it cannot now either accomplish or prevent them.

After Thirty Years

POWER was the issue on which the youthful Alfred E. Smith began his climb to the governorship at the New York State constitutional convention of 1915; power is the issue on which Smith remains most conspicuously silent at the constitutional convention of 1938. "Governor Smith," *The Nation* said on December 22, 1926, "has won fresh laurels in the water-power fight in that he compelled by ten days of publicity the New York State Water Power Commission, which is about to go out of existence, to forego its plans to lease the St. Lawrence River to the aluminum trust and allied interests." Who could have foretold that twelve years later the aluminum trust's foe would become its silent partner in a struggle to prevent public development of the Niagara and the St. Lawrence?

If the present constitutional convention brings into sharper relief the tragic apostasy of Alfred E. Smith, it also illustrates the patience, the pertinacity, and the craftiness with which the aluminum trust and the power trust pursue their intention to gain possession of two of our greatest sources of power. An amendment to prohibit future diversion of water from the Niagara by private interests was killed in the constitutional convention of 1894. The attempt to write public ownership and development into the constitution at the convention of 1915 was likewise defeated. At the present convention, with a Republican majority on hand, the aluminum and power interests sponsor a series of ingenious amendments that would cripple state development of water-power resources, make it more difficult for municipalities to own their own utility plants, and leave the way open for private exploitation. The state or any political subdivision would be forbidden to assume the liabilities of a public corporation. The present constitutional provision forbidding the lending of state credit to a private corporation, a relic of the days when railroad promoters bought legislatures, would be extended to public corporations. A municipal-debt commission would be set up with a veto over any item of capital expenditure by municipalities; a municipal-finance commission would be established with the right to review municipal budgets. Either could be used to block the financing of a municipal power plant. The Public Service Commission would regulate public as well as privately owned utilities, a perversion of purpose that could be used to make public operation a nightmare of entangling technicalities. The Power Authority, proposed under Smith and set up under Roosevelt to develop the St. Lawrence, would lose its present right to regulate rates by contract. Power districts, an idea particularly fruitful in rural areas, could not be established. The Power Authority would be unable to build its own generating facilities and transmission lines, as Roosevelt intended, unless it could negotiate a satisfactory contract with private companies.

These proposed amendments would undo most of the progress made toward public development of Niagara and the St. Lawrence under the governorships of Odell, Higgins, Hughes, Sulzer, Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman. Whether most of them can be written into the state constitution, and whether a constitution containing them would be ratified at the polls, is doubtful. The aluminum trust will be satisfied if it can keep bottled up in the Republican-controlled public-utilities committee the Poletti amendment to declare the water-power resources of Niagara and the St. Lawrence inalienable. Public ownership was thought to have triumphed in 1907 when the Legislature, at the suggestion of Governor Hughes, directed an official body "to devise plans for the progressive development of the water powers of the state under state ownership, control, and maintenance for the public use and benefit and for the increase of the public revenue." That public ownership should still be in jeopardy thirty years later indicates the snail's pace of progress in a lucrative field where democratic processes are forced to wait on the pleasure of vast concentrations of moneyed power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where Murder Is Overlooked

BY PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Washington, July 25

WHEN do murder and assault cease to be punishable as criminal offenses? Answer: when committed on strikers and members of the general public for the purpose of violating a federal statute—the National Labor Relations Act. That is no rhetorical declaration; it is a plain statement of a shocking fact which has forced itself on public attention repeatedly during the last three years despite the apathy of prosecuting authorities and vast areas of the daily press. If you are on your way to consummate a business transaction which seems calculated to cut into my profits and I hire a gangster to slug or shoot you, that is a crime for which I might fry in the chair. But if you are my employee, seeking to exercise your lawful right of collective bargaining, I can have you slugged, shot, gassed, or bombed with perfect safety to myself, because I have merely acted to "protect property." The law does not say so, but that is how it works in actual practice. In an aggravated case, such as would occur if my hired gunmen mistook you for a striker when, in fact, you were only an accidental bystander, my lawyers might deem it prudent for me to compensate your surviving kin with a lump sum to avert a civil suit for damages. Under none of these circumstances, however, would I be exposed to the danger of arrest.

For the benefit of employers who may contemplate availing themselves of this immunity, I must point out that it operates in differing degrees according to locality. In Chicago the uniformed police are glad to perform the required violence free of charge, and the employer has only to relax and be comfortable until the dead and wounded are carted away. In Johnstown, Pennsylvania, and Massillon, Ohio, employers were required to furnish the necessary men and munitions, after which the city authorities took full charge and assumed all responsibility. But in Canton both the city police and the sheriff declined to assist in any way except by keeping hands off, and it was necessary for the employer not only to supply his own rifles, shotguns, gas equipment, and armored cars, but also to import the thugs who operated them. To the heavy initial cost thus involved was added a large sum for personal injuries and property damages. In these and in hundreds of localities where serious violence has not occurred but merely been anticipated, it was deemed advisable by the steel industry alone to spend more than half a million dollars in two years on newspaper advertising designed to create a "public opinion" favorable to the industry. Thus, while homicide, mayhem, and assault are quite safe for industrialists they are not always free.

The foregoing reflections and admonitions are prompted by five days of testimony before the Senate Civil Liberties Committee last week, dealing with the origin and incidents of a strike in the Berger plant of the Republic Steel Corporation in Canton in 1935, considered in conjunction with similar evidence which I have heard and seen in the last two years. How "law and order" came to South Chicago, Johnstown, and Massillon at a cost of twelve lives and many cripplings, as a result of Republic's and Bethlehem's resistance to the Wagner Act, has already been told in these pages. Canton is a new and somewhat different story. In the other three instances most of the victims were striking members of the C. I. O. steel workers' union. The Canton casualties were composed in part of A. F. of L. men and in much larger part of innocent members of the general public, including a heavy percentage of women and children. One, a pregnant housewife, received two charges of buckshot in her legs and feet while walking along a country road two miles distant from the strike scene. I am happy to report that Republic promptly dispatched a card of sympathy and a handsome bouquet to her bedside in the hospital, and subsequently paid $7,500 for permanent injuries to her feet—although not until its agent had grumbled that she "still had both her legs and a fine baby and ought to be satisfied with $1,800."

The strike, called by a local of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, had been anticipated by the management, which had called in company guards from its plants in Youngstown, Warren, and Buffalo. Ample supplies of firearms and gas had been laid in, and trucks were armored with steel plate. Witnesses agreed that the first violence was precipitated personally by Charles M. White, Republic's vice president in charge of production, whose conduct and statements before the Senate committee were what you would expect from Girdler's right-hand man, only cruder.

For two days, according to the testimony of numerous witnesses, armored cars loaded with guards made repeated sorties into the city streets, discharging gas and buckshot indiscriminately, while guards on foot sallied from the plant gates wielding iron bars, steel bolts, and blackjacks on everyone in reach. Two uniformed city

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policemen were gassed when they attempted to halt an armored car. A dozen school-children who took refuge in a restaurant were bombarded with sickening gas shells through the windows. An elderly invalid was gassed while sitting on his doorstep and died a few days afterward, partly from gas and shock. A non-striking worker from another plant received four hundred buckshot in the back when he ran to escape from guards who were beating him. A man on the sidewalk was struck in the mouth with an exploding gas shell, his teeth knocked out, his jaw shattered. Space will not permit bare mention of all the atrocities. None of the guards was a deputized peace officer. The company halted their homicidal forays into the city streets only after the city solicitor had applied for an injunction and the sheriff had threatened to meet them with machine guns.

Vice President White explained: "Some of these incidents were regrettable. . . . Mrs. Reed [the pregnant housewife] has our sympathy. . . . I don't know how such things can be avoided unless there is law and order. . . . The workman ought to be protected in his right to come and go from work without wearing a C. I. O. button, a Masonic emblem, a Knights of Columbus button, the swastika, or anything else. . . . The American flag ought to be good enough for anyone. It's good enough for me."

It is notorious among newspaper men that instances of company violence in the steel strike went unreported until brought to light before the La Follette committee. Chicago's horrible Memorial Day Massacre, in which ten men were killed, seven by being shot in the back, had been passed off as a "riot" until the committee got possession of the newsreel which recorded the ghastly reality. Nor were the facts of Massillon and Johnstown ever disclosed until the Labor Relations Board and the Senate committee dug them out. Consequently, last week's disclosure that the steel industry was spending vast sums through the newspapers to influence public opinion, and, in Republic's case, attempting to bring direct pressure to bear on editors through advertisers and local businessmen, has a sinister significance. Were the newspapers bought or browbeaten? Let them answer and explain. Above all, let us hear what Col. McCormick, Frank Gannett, and the American Newspaper Publishers Association think of this attack on the freedom of the press. They were voluble enough when they had only Senator Minton to fear. Of course, he is not an advertiser.

Spain's Tragic Anniversary

BY LOUIS FISCHER

Paris, July 12

ON July 30, 1936, three Italian bombers landed by mistake near Oran, in French Africa. The French High Commissioner at Rabat, reporting this incident to his Paris superiors, stated that the pilots, who were en route to Spanish Morocco to aid Franco, had received their flying orders from the Italian government on July 15. The Spanish insurrection broke out on July 17.

The conflict was never a pure civil war. The Italian and German governments participated in its advance preparations. From the very beginning it partook of the nature of a foreign invasion abetted by the Spanish military, whose loyalty to caste and property exceeded their love of country and progress. The war was planned and started by oath-breaking generals with the support of domestic reactionaries and in collusion with outside powers bent on acquiring raw materials, markets, and strategic positions.

This initiative has cost Spain dearly. On both sides almost a million men, women, and children have been killed in battles, homes, and prisons. Some Loyalist towns and villages have been completely pulverized by aerial bombs. Every republican city has been partially destroyed in air raids or in fighting. Three million persons, fleeing before the rebel forces, are refugees in Loyalist territory. They and the rest of the civil population in the government zone suffer from food scarcity. Life is full of torture for these ten million human beings. Bereaved and hungry, they undergo the additional trial of repeated and ubiquitous bombardments from the air. Men and women whom the blood-chilling air-raid siren may have called to the underground shelters two or three times a night for a total period of several hours are expected to work with maximum intensity the next day producing munitions and other goods. Children play air-raid games, make classroom sketches of airplanes dropping bombs, and grow accustomed to seeing flattened bodies, torsos, and limbs removed from debris by men who stand in pools of human blood. Time makes the sorrow, nervous and physical strain, and loss cumulative. When the effect was greatest, the fascists intensified their air war and sought to impose an air blockade.

The hate engendered in the surviving victims against the perpetrators of these cruelties and of the original crime of injecting war into a peaceful nation becomes a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

major political factor. Franco, if he should win, could never govern with these people. He would have to rule over them and despite them. There is no peace in Franco. He imported the Moors, the Germans, the Italians. He lacerated his native land. The contempt for him and his allies explains the resistance of the republicans. He stands for the old Spain of poverty and social stagnation. The fierceness of the Loyalists' opposition, against heart-breaking odds, to the fascist advance is a measure of their rejection of Spain's past and their hope for a better future. It warrants the prediction that the war will go on beyond most people's expectation. If and when Franco achieves a victory on the field of battle the struggle against the feudal land tenure, hierarchical darkness, and low living standards will continue. The republic heralded the possibility of a French revolution in Spain. The Francos demurred. Spain will never be content unless it can at least overtake Europe's nineteenth century.

On July 17, 1936, the republican government was weak and indecisive. That encouraged its enemies to strike. But the improbability of quick victory and resentment against the invader have given the republic strength and cohesion it never possessed in peacetime. Social programs which could only find permanent application after the war are relegated to the background. Fervid patriotism replaces the party feuds and ideological combats of pre-war politics. The reverse is happening in Franco's territory. When the rebels reached the coast in the March-April Aragon offensive and severed Catalonia from Central Spain, it seemed to the rebels and to their friends abroad that the end of the war impended. This belief released bitter inter-factional rivalry in the rebel camp. Monarchists, fascist Falange, and army chiefs made bids for power. Such strife, natural enough when peace follows war, cannot now be arrested, even though the war, surprisingly to some, proceeds with increasing fierceness. Falange leaders and many of their supporters are being jailed, and the Church and the other big estate owners brand them as "our Reds," probably because they evince some interest in the fate of the peasantry. The rebel zone is duplicating, roughly, the class struggle which rocked all of Spain before the war commenced.

Franco has never conscripted heavily in Castile, Andalusia, or Estremadura. For in these provinces the peasantry is land-hungry. But the manpower of Morocco is well-nigh exhausted. Franco has taken 100,000 Moors to Spain. They have borne the brunt of numerous battles. He cannot expect to recruit many more even though the frontier between Spain and France, in Africa, is open, and the rebels have been drawing French Moors into their services. Franco must get additional Italians or mobilize Spanish villagers of doubtful loyalty. The fighting in recent weeks on the Castellon-Teruel-Sagunto front is perhaps the bloodiest of the war. Losses on both

"Oo look, Drake! The Spanish Armada!"
"Well, really, I don't think that's quite nice of them! Signal that if they sink our fleet our good relations with any government they may form may be seriously impaired."
LOW

HISTORY RETOLD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sides have been extremely heavy, but Franco's human resources are limited, whereas the republic's are only now being tapped. The Loyalists have 700,000 soldiers today and plan to have a million under arms by the autumn. There are at present approximately 9,000 foreigners in the republican army. No more than 4,000 of these are at the front. The total of non-Spaniards who enlisted in the Loyalist army (International Brigade) since hostilities started is about 36,000. Thousands were killed, incapacitated, or repatriated. There were never more than 700 Soviet Russians serving under the republican colors, and the number now is unlikely to be over 300. Franco, observers estimate, has between 6,000 and 10,000 Germans and 60,000 and 80,000 Italians. The International Brigade consists of volunteers, some of whom came to Spain despite the obstructions of their governments. The Italians and Germans were sent by their governments.

The rebels have a vast superiority in equipment. Italian and German arms were available to Franco from the first day of the insurrection. The quantity has increased and their quality improved with time. The first Soviet material, on the other hand, arrived in the fourth week of October, 1936—three months after the outbreak. Its flow, which was never as broad as the fascist munitions stream, has been interrupted by submarine piracy in the Mediterranean and by the closing of the Spanish-French border. Moreover, all fascist airplanes fly into Spain, and some of the recent bombing of coastal cities and shipping has been carried out by Italian machines which rose from airdromes in Italy or Sardinia, dropped their missiles on Loyalist cities, and then returned to their bases. But no Soviet planes have been flown into Spain. They come by long and difficult sea and land routes. Barcelona pays for and acquires title to all the arms it imports from the U. S. S. R. and other countries. This is not true of Franco's imports from fascist states.

"Non-intervention" has worked to the disadvantage of the Spanish republic because England and France, the two nations whose national and imperial interests might normally impel them to help the Loyalists, have faithfully abided by the agreement. It works to the advantage of the rebels because Germany and Italy intervene. These regimes have included Spain in their expansionist schemes. They have set themselves military, political, and economic goals in Spain. They have invested armies, arms, air armadas, and the blood of thousands of their subjects in the venture. Parliamentary declarations and legal documents will not eject them. The stake is too important. They could be deterred only by their own exhaustion, of which there are faint signs and which, if it became more serious, might prevent them from undertaking other acts of aggression, or by a clear indication, backed by peaceful deeds, that the Western powers wanted the invaders to get out of Spain. But Mussolini and Hitler are entitled to believe that the British and French governments are reconciled to a Franco victory. That victory cannot be won without further intervention. The fascists will therefore continue to intervene. Hence the skepticism about the execution of the British plan for the evacuation of foreign combatants. It is not merely that the scheme offers a thousand technical difficulties, loopholes, and opportunities for procrastination. If it were really intended to make non-intervention real it would provide for the removal of foreign arms and the interdiction of their ingress. As it is, unlimited squadrons of fascist airplanes can still be brought in by air. The cordon around the Loyalists, however, is complete. Rome and Berlin, as well as Burgos, therefore, can only conclude that the plan is not calculated to rob them of their ultimate triumph. They will behave accordingly.

What is required of the democratic powers who wish to create or sustain a reputation of opposition to aggression—America waits for such signs—is simply not to strangle Loyalist resistance, which yet has tremendous potentialities. Spain ruined Napoleon. It can ruin lesser men, both interventionists and non-interventionists. The outcome of the Spanish war is by no means certain. Between 1914 and 1918 Germany won most of the battles. So far Franco has won most of the battles. Except one—the one for the support and loyalty of the Spanish people.

Spain is a second-rate country somewhat removed from the heart of Europe. But the Spanish conflict is determining the foreign policies and plays a gigantic role in the internal affairs of most of the major powers. Spain may decide the fate of ministers, of ministries, and, equally, of countries. The fate of Spain itself is important enough. But Spain is regarded by the fascist dictators as the beginning of bigger things. It would be one more conquest for totalitarianism and thus prejudice the issue against democracy in neighboring states. More immediately, the fascist victory in Spain would pave the way to further assaults on peaceful nations. Anti-fascists have been making this assertion and it has been regarded by the naive as propaganda. Here is how the Italian fascist *Resto del Carlino* put it on June 30, 1938:

> The solution of the Czechoslovak problem and of the colonial problem will be facilitated from the day when communism and its blind auxiliary, democracy, will have suffered a bloody defeat in the Iberian peninsula. On that day, France, before mobilizing on the Rhine, will have to think of its other frontiers: that of the Alps and that of the Pyrenees.

When the fascists launch other wars the democracies will not be able to complain that they were not warned. The democracies have ears and eyes—but Spain is a test. If the Western powers allow Spain to be submerged they will invite more trouble, perhaps nearer home.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Billion-Dollar Poolroom Racket

BY F. B. WARREN

I.

IN 1937 close to $400,000,000 was bet at the 70-odd race tracks of the United States, which rotate operations in such a fashion that there is horse racing somewhere in the country virtually every week day in the year. But this tidy sum is only one-third of the betting that is done. For something like $4,000,000 a day, a billion and a quarter a year, changes hands illegally through the medium of bookmakers operating away from the tracks. The bookmaker is the local representative of the betting empire, and his book is simply the line of odds. The mathematics of making this book—short prices against the favorites, long odds against the unknowns or the undistinguished—is as definite as the processes of calculus. No matter what happens when the race is run, the bookmaker has arranged his book in advance so that it must yield a profit of anywhere from 7 to 30 per cent.

There is no official confirmation for these figures on illicit betting because the business pays no taxes. Graft to politicians—municipal, state, and county, as well as police—is paid in staggering sums; but not a cent in taxes. Last summer, however, the extent of the industry was revealed when more than 200 poolroom operators in seven cities checked the total business handled by them in their own establishments in order to determine the average financial outlay of their regular patrons. They found a top bracket whose members phoned in bets of from $100 to $500 on a single race. But they discovered that the overwhelming preponderance of wagers were for one or two dollars, and many more for as low as fifty cents—the minimum permitted. The average fresh capital taken in by the poolroom each day proved to be a little more than four dollars per person.

For the purposes of this article I am figuring that there are 2,000 such poolrooms operating throughout the nation—only because that is the number I can personally identify. Professional operators insist that the total is closer to 10,000, and they undoubtedly know what they are talking about. The ratio, even on my conservative basis, is about five illegal bets to one legally made at the track. It should be remembered, moreover, that a patron who attends the races can bet only on those carded at the track he attends; at ten dollars a race he can lose a maximum of eighty dollars. If the same player shunned the track and spent his afternoon at a poolroom, he could—and many do—bet on from forty to seventy races in a period of five hours. While doing so, he could hear descriptions of the running of at least forty of the races taking place across the continent.

Before we consider the strings which hold together this billion-dollar empire, it might be well to have a look at the place that handles such extra-legal betting. Take the average poolroom in any city of a population above 20,000. Its owner might be anyone not burdened by too many scruples. His chief requirement as far as the betting is concerned is two or three copies of racing papers—a set for himself and his records, one or more sets for his customers' use. These are highly important and we shall examine their nature in our next article. Unless there is an epidemic of honest law enforcement in the area, he can quickly make a deal with the equally indispensable news service for a wire connection and other mechanical equipment (for which he puts up a deposit or forfeit) and begin at once to accept wagers. Of course every time he turns around the chances are he will discover a uniformed or plainclothes officer. They don't want to stop his business; they simply want their rake-off and occasionally a rake-off for an unnamed superior. The proprietor may make $200 a week, of which half as a rule will go for this kind of graft.

The typical poolroom is a bare, unadorned, disordered space in as obscure a loft or business building as the tenant can find. It must not be in a good shopping district where influential owners, paying high taxes, can make trouble. Its visible equipment is unimpressive: a table for the proprietor and his telephone clerks, plenty of chairs; other tables or shelves on which the customers can write their bets and pass them over with their cash. While some "marker," or credit, business is done with well-known customers, who settle all their transactions at the end of the day or week, by far the greatest part of the wagering is on a basis of cash with each bet, with payoff to the winners immediately after the race. Some of the business telephoned in by players is also "marker" business, the house not having the cash on hand when the race is run. The money is transferred through a minor army of collectors. If a player loses and hesitates to pay up, he goes on a blacklist of all poolrooms; he won't do any more betting. The poolroom owner himself rarely welshes. He doesn't have to—all the percentages are in his favor.

In its mechanical equipment the poolroom is far more complex than in its furnishings. There is a battery of telephones, some possessing intricate switching devices

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so that calls can be thrown to idle operators and message-takers when the traffic approaches peak. Hundreds, in some communities thousands, of customers know these numbers; they are listed in the directories with the principals designated as bankers or brokers. Even more important, however, is a compact, effective radio. It is the local outlet for the news-gathering and transmitting service which operates from every major race track in the United States and Canada to furnish simultaneous national distribution of information to poolrooms. The base operating point of this service is in Chicago or New York, with sub-bases or terminals in hundreds of cities. A single sending voice at the main office is heard at the same instant by hundreds of poolroom operators and thousands of customers. The poolroom instrument does not pull in its news from anything so public as an airwave. It is connected to a purely local telephone wire rented from the local company, and that wire leads directly to the local "terminal," which in common with other city terminals receives by a nation-wide circuit of long-distance lines the day's information from track representatives and employees at the clearing and relay bases. No other material and no other client gets on these long lines or on the short local connecting lines to each poolroom outlet during the hours when they are under lease to the news service.

The telephone company and its subsidiaries have nothing to do with the operation of this racing service. Their wire facilities, maintained in working order at all times, are merely rented or leased to private corporations by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company for a set number of hours. "We do not want to deal with people who are breaking the law, whether it is race horses or anything else," said Walter S. Gifford, president of the A. T. & T., in the course of a Federal Communications Commission hearing in 1936. "This is a messy part of our business. It is difficult because we are advised on one side that we cannot legally defend refusal to give service in many cases where it would be our inclination and desire to do so, having no right to discriminate on the ground of character between subscribers, while on the other hand the Attorney General of Rhode Island has expressed the view at these hearings that we should be guided in our decisions by the character of applicants. . . . It seems to me that the matter is one for local law enforcement."

Early in the morning, when the proprietor and a few aides—but no customers—are present, the leased wire opens. This early "broadcast" states the agreed official odds that the gambling proprietors are to offer on each horse carded to run that day at any track in the nation. If Chicolorado, Transen, or Petty Paw comes out in the morning line at 6 to 1, an early-morning patron can write his ticket on any one or all three to win their respective races. For each win later in the afternoon the establishment will pay the bettor seven dollars for each dollar wagered, that is, his own dollar plus the six he has won. But these odds are not static; if the horse selected in the morning at 6 to 1 should recede at post time to 12 to 1, the morning bettor still gets his 6 to 1 and the luckier player in the poolroom who made his bet at closing prices reaps the 12-to-1 payoff. Conversely a horse that started the day at 6 to 1 may close at 6 to 5. Then the player in the room who took closing prices gets $2.20 for each dollar, including his own dollar back.

Plainly the making of the morning line is a job of grave responsibility. Betting sharpshooters all over the nation pore over each day's line, counter-checked against the split-second telegraphic reports of the workouts of horses. What they hope to find are horses of demonstrated ability against which a dangerously long price is being laid. By the time that horse is lined up for his race such morning discrepancies will have been discovered and the long price of the morning shortened. If startlingly long prices have been laid on a good horse in the morning and numerous wagers have been taken at that price before the odds shift, the bookmakers nationally stand to lose several hundred thousand dollars. And if some acutely informed owner, trainer, or friend, with advance knowledge of his horse's prowess, could in any way influence the making of a long price on the animal in a morning line, that owner or trainer could register a "killing"; he could, through agents, telegraph money to agents at all the major gambling centers of the country the night before with instructions to bet thousands of dollars at the morning odds. There is powerful machinery through which the bookmakers protect themselves against such exigencies, but for all that, "killings" do happen occasionally.

At about one o'clock the bettors in the East begin to crowd into the poolrooms. The wires are about to open for the afternoon. The establishment's runners and collectors of street and neighborhood bets have brought in their bundles of written slips with cash to cover the bets. At this juncture the proprietor sets out to protect himself. He swiftly ascertains whether there is a dangerously large amount of money being wagered on a particular horse. If so, and he fears that this horse may win, he turns to the elaborate machinery which has been fashioned to meet this situation, machinery which offers a remarkable parallel to the Federal Reserve banking system. The bookmaker puts in a long-distance telephone call to a super-bookmaker in another city. To him he "lays off" all or part of the total wagers on the horse which he fears may endanger his capital. Just as the Federal Reserve charges interest and makes money by serving the smaller banks, so the super-bookmakers have scales or service charges or interest rates for reducing the risk of the local operator. The final step in this sequence is important. If the super-books of the nation find themselves overloaded after relieving the burden on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

small-fry, they hurriedly transfer money by wire to the various tracks where the horses heavily wagered on are running. This money is bet at the tracks and goes through the mutuel machines there. It is only at that point that all these transactions gain their first semblance of legality; when the money passes through the mutuel machines, the state derives a portion of the total.

When the player enters the poolroom, he has, on the average, about four dollars to work with. On a given afternoon tracks may be in operation at Narragansett in Rhode Island, Aqueduct in New York, Hawthorne in Chicago, Beulah Park near Columbus, Thorncliffe in Toronto, and Fairmount Park in Collinsville, Illinois. In the course of the afternoon a player will hear the running at six tracks with an average card of seven races at each. On the wall he sees six sets of large, white sheets bearing the names of the competing horses, a set for each track, a sheet for each race. The names are arranged in the order of their post positions at the track. Number 1 horse is next to the rail; numbers 8, 9, and 10 are on the outside. Beside the name of each horse appears the weight the horse is carrying—a figure which includes the weight of the jockey and the lead-laden saddle-pads assigned by the track handicapper to "level off" the contestants. Penciled in is the name of the jockey riding each animal. If the horse is a filly or mare and entitled to a weight allowance based on sex, an asterisk denotes that fact. Much of this extra information has come in over the leased wire in the morning and has been checked by the bookmaker's staff.

There may be three or four races in progress simultaneously at different tracks. The excited, staccato voice of the announcer, coming over the leased wire, slices these into each other. He gives the quarter call at Hawthorne, the quarter call at Narragansett, Beulah, and so on. Since everyone in the room has placed bets at several or all the tracks, he distributes his excitement impartially to each contest.

The player in Elkhart, Indiana, gets his first action out of the opening race at Narragansett a few minutes after 1:30 P.M. central time and an hour later in the East. Rain is falling and the track is muddy. Stone Martin has a mud marking in the racing sheets and is a favorite at 8 to 5 in the last run-down. (The run-down is the shift in odds. It reflects actual betting at the tracks by spectators there and money dumped at the tracks by superbookmakers who are transferring some dangerous risks into the lap of the management.) In the same race Lotafun, boasting an impressive recent record, is 4 to 1 to win. So the player bets $1 to win on Stone Martin and $1 to place on Lotafun; this is half of his total capital. If he loses two such ventures, he is through for the afternoon.

Having written his ticket on these two horses at Narragansett, he glances at the charts for the first race at Aqueduct in New York, to be run fifteen minutes later. He discovers that Bright News, running there, opened in the betting at 6 to 1 and is now quoted in the later run-down at 4 to 1. Thereupon the player writes on his same ticket, "If coming, $1 to win, $1 to place on Bright News, first Aqueduct," which means that the Aqueduct bet is contingent on his winning at Narragansett. He hands the cashier his ticket and two of his four dollars and waits for the running of the two races.

Let's be benevolent and say that Stone Martin did win and Lotafun did come in second, the former paying $1.60 as the winner, the latter paying $1 for running second, or even money. The bookmaker therefore owed the player $4.60, including his own $2; he had doubled his money. But he isn't paid off until the fate of his "if" bet on Bright News is decided.

Fifteen minutes later it is reported that Bright News won the first race at Aqueduct. The country poolroom, on races at New York tracks, takes the first and the last run-down odds, 6 to 1 and 3 to 1 in this case, and splits the difference, paying off at 4½ to 1. (This "settlement" bears only on odds listed in the afternoon; the morning line previously discussed remains unaffected.) The bookmaker hands the player $10.10 on his double ticket. Added to the $2 still in his pocket, he now has $12.10. He has trebled his capital, made a 200 per cent profit in thirty minutes. He should now leave and never return. But instead he figures that there are forty more races to be run, that he can bet a dollar on twelve of these without facing bankruptcy. Each additional victory from then on lengthens the time he can play; he may win a long shot at 10 to 1 or 15 to 1—but the overwhelming likelihood is that he won't. He is likely to depart, at the end of a tense and crowded afternoon, with a few dimes received in ragged change—and minus his capital of $4.

He can win a single race. He can triumph for an afternoon. But he can't beat the races. That is the one universal about poolrooms. For he has more than odds against him. There is an elaborate system designed to protect the bookie and impose limitations upon the "killing." Our player, for example, received 4½ to 1 on the winning horse. At the track, as the odds indicated, he would have received 6 to 1. Why? Simply because the poolrooms protect themselves by limiting the odds they will pay—no matter what the payoff is at the track. Some poolrooms have a maximum scale of 20, 8, and 4; the average scale for all poolrooms is closer to 15, 7, and 3, that is, 15 to 1 on a bet to win, 7 to 1 on a bet that the horse will place second, 3 to 1 on a bet that the horse will run third.

Thus the poolroom bettor suffers under far heavier handicaps than the man who wagers at a track where the mutuel system prevails. Not that the mutuels are above criticism. They cannot "lay off" bets elsewhere when these pile in from track patrons and over the wire; what they can do, however, is to dump some of the track's own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

funds through the mutuel windows on the favorite or favorites just before race time and thus reduce the size of the winning price, winners thereby getting less than they should and the track management retaining more. There are tracks where this is a familiar practice, but no one explores the subject any further "for the good of racing in general."

A more effective—and more dishonest—method of doctoring the mutuels reaps even greater savings for the track management and defrauds all bettors, at the track or in distant poolrooms. The management holds out the "come-back money" received by wire or through agents from the poolroom and gambling clearing houses until the race for which the money was sent has been run. Suppose that Teakettle, Chutney, and A la King are entered in a race about to be run, along with nine other entries; only three of the twelve can finish in the money. In the overnight or morning line sent out to poolrooms the odds against Teakettle are 15 to 1. This would indicate 4 to 1 or 5 to 1 to place and 2 to 1 even to show. It also indicates that Teakettle possesses little or no "form" on past records. But in the course of the day let us assume that bettors throughout America have illogically determined—by "hunch"—that Teakettle has a chance and have made wagers accordingly. By the time the animal goes to the post the odds have narrowed to 5 to 1. In the running Teakettle wins the race easily and at his closing price of 5 to 1 would pay $12 for each $2 wagered to win, $6 for place, $4 for show. But back in the mutuel cage, a corrupt management is holding out, say, $10,000 that has been wired by the nation's poolrooms and betting commissioners, some of it to be wagered on Teakettle. At the moment Teakettle wins, the "inside" representative of the management dumps every penny of the outside money, which has been held in suspense, on Teakettle, except for those portions which had been bet on the horses that had finished second or third. What happens? It is thus made to appear that, at post time, Teakettle had become the actual favorite. Because of this illicit contribution to the pool, Teakettle pays off 7 to 5 ($4.80) to win, 4 to 5 ($3.60) to place, and 2 to 5 ($2.80) to show. Every person who bet on Teakettle has been robbed wholesale.

The bettor's life is destined to be an unhappy one—whether he bets at a reputable track, at a manipulated track, or in one of the thousands of poolrooms which constitute a vast illegal American industry. At best he faces artificial, criminal, and natural hazards, but of the whole species the poolroom bettor is easily the worst victim.

[*In an early issue Mr. Warren will describe the Annenberg racing chart system and the use to which it is put in the operation of the billion-dollar poolroom betting racket.*]

In the Wind

UNDER A Moscow date line the United Press recently issued a sensational report that Soviet Russia had declared a "state-of-war" emergency in Eastern Siberia. The dispatch was carried in newspapers throughout the nation. Two hours after its issuance, the U. P. sent out a bulletin killing the story. What really happened was that the dispatch had been filed from the Berlin bureau, as is frequently done in such crises; but its source was a mysterious phone message, delivered in a Russian accent, and purporting to come from the U. P. office in Moscow. It now appears that the "tip" was a gift from an agent of the Nazi government.

FRANK B. NOYES was for thirty years head of the Associated Press; his paper, the Washington *Evening Star,* recently carried this headline on the current La Follette probe: "Republic Spent $667,000 on Peace." What the story meant by peace was the fund spent by Republic Steel in smashing strikes, including $11,000 for munitions and gas.

GERMAN GENERALS in China, relates an American journalist just returned from there, do not appreciate the Chinese concept of "face." A Chinese soldier was recently riding on horseback beside a German officer at the head of a detachment. Passing through a private orchard the Chinese reached up and snatched a peach from a low-hanging branch of a tree. The German casually indicated his disapproval. He had no notion that the Chinese soldier would commit suicide that night—because he had been reprimanded in public.

CATHOLIC AGENCIES have launched a concerted attack against the coming World Youth Congress, although almost all religious and political groups are participating in it. Reflecting this attack, the New York *Times* ran this headline when Mayor La Guardia greeted spokesmen of the Congress: "Mayor Welcomes 'Red' Youth Congress." Perhaps the headline writer and author of the story didn't know that Mrs. John Finley, wife of the editor of the *Times,* is a member of the Congress's sponsoring committee.

ITALIAN ACADEMICIANS have recently discovered that Italians are really as noble Aryans as the Germans. This disclosure may startle German experts on the same subject; for years they have relied on H. S. Chamberlain's "The Foundations of the 19th Century" as the theoretical source of the pure-Aryan doctrine. This volume asserts that "their [the Italians'] genealogy goes back to the countless thousands of liberated slaves from Africa and Asia, to the jumble of various Italic peoples, to the military colonies settled among them from all countries of the world, in short the chaos of peoples which the empire so ingeniously manufactured."

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind. The $5 prize for the best item submitted during July goes to Dr. Otto Peyser of Jamaica, Long Island, for the citation from H. S. Chamberlain printed above.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THIS is an article that I have written before—not once but several times—and I am afraid that I shall have to write it again and again. My text is the words President Roosevelt used at San Francisco on July 14, when he declared that 1939 would be a year of "world-wide rejoicing" if it saw "definite steps toward permanent world peace. That is the hope and the prayer of the overwhelming number of men and women and children in all the earth today." And then he said significantly enough that money spent on armaments would not create permanent wealth and that "we fervently hope for the day when the other leading nations of the world will realize that their present course must inevitably lead them to disaster." And then he added his usual remark that we stand ready to meet the nations and "encourage them in any effort they may make toward a definite reduction in world armaments."

The very next day on the other side of the water Sir John Simon, Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in Parliament, July 15, these pregnant words: "There have been other civilizations than ours. Tutankhamen was forgotten until he was dug up, and it is quite possible that the things that are protecting our civilization are more slender than they are sometimes thought to be. This country has resources, character, courage, and history, which will see it through; but make no mistake—if we do not succeed and the world does not succeed in finding some way to end the folly of this everlasting expenditure on armaments, then indeed the future we shall be preparing for our children is one at which we may shudder." Precisely. Yet Sir John Simon is but stating in another way what Stanley Baldwin said just before he became Prime Minister the last time: that if an armament race starts in Europe it will lead *not to peace but to war.*

Finally, we have another and a startling witness in Dr. Raymond Buell of the Foreign Policy Association, who has just returned from two months of intensive study of conditions in Poland and Central Europe to report that the huge expenditures for armaments will drive the democracies into becoming totalitarian states in order to gear their economic life to the necessity of steadily increasing expenditures for military and naval purposes. I take it that his thesis is that just as we should immediately have to adopt their methods and practices in order to defeat them if we went to war with them, so we shall soon have to resort to all the economic devices and stratagems to which they resort today in order to be able to devote perhaps as much as 50 per cent of our income to armaments.

So there is this old problem, about which I have written so often, restated in its latest aspects, and everybody says, "After you, Alphonse." Sir John Simon's government knows the peril of what it is doing but has nothing to suggest and will take no lead in moving toward disarmament until it has built its armaments up to that impossible point—never yet reached—when the nation will feel that it has all the armament it needs to protect itself and frighten its enemies. Mr. Roosevelt characteristically speaks of his hope that the year 1939 will bring a change, but he proposes nothing for either 1938 or 1939 in the way of leadership on our part. It is the most complete bankruptcy of statesmanship in the history of the modern world. All the national leaders agree on the inevitable disaster which will come from the continuance of this policy, and yet not one of them can see that the way to disarm is to disarm. Everybody says, "Why, of course we should like to disarm, but look at that fellow across our frontier and see with what he threatens us." They are even willing to admit—some of them—that the present impasse is solely due to the fact that the Allies and the United States failed to keep their promises made at Versailles to disarm. Then they continue to arm in order to make the horrible blundering and treachery of the Allies more costly than ever. And when you ask them to do something they say, "Why, we can't do anything until everybody is willing to disarm, and somebody else must take the lead."

So what, Mr. Roosevelt? Those are sound words that you spoke, and truthful. So what? Are you just going to stand by and do nothing? Are you content to admit that the world is headed for destruction and to do nothing about it? If so, you won't expect us to regard you as a constructive statesman, because it is, or used to be, the duty of statesmen to find a way out of the messes into which they got the nations. The way to disarm is to disarm, and the one great nation that can safely do it is the United States, which cannot be invaded, and—I defy anybody to disprove this—is beyond danger of attack. If I were the President I should ask for an immediate disarmament conference, and I should call one conference after another until something was achieved—or inevitable world suicide admitted.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS and the ARTS

M. Sylvestre

MONDAY NIGHT. By Kay Boyle. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

ROUGHER in texture than Miss Boyle's other novels, "Monday Night" shows a like interest in technique, in the handling of a technical problem. If the problem is not new, it is one that must always fascinate novelist and reader alike, for it consists of portraying character at second-hand, and a not too trustworthy second-hand at that. Specifically, there is M. Sylvestre, whom we never meet, an expert whose testimony at poisoning trials is final; and there is Wilt, a drink-pickled, down-at-the-heel American writer in Paris who gets on Sylvestre's track and starts wondering about his grisly, implacable profession.

Wilt gets on the track casually—by running across a young American medical student who has come to Paris hoping to meet the celebrated expert. Their first problem is simply how to get hold of the man. But inquiries soon lead to revelations: from Sylvestre's servants and others, Wilt and Bernie hear tales of Sylvestre pacing the floor for hours, of Sylvestre throwing over the mistress he loved for a useful marriage with a cold Englishwoman. At first Wilt has thought of Sylvestre as a divided man—a man of feeling made heartsick by the lives he has to condemn, a man of science forced by an incorruptible integrity to condemn them. But slowly he begins to visualize a man who forfeited youth and happiness to ambition and who, thereafter, sought revenge from life by destroying youth and happiness in others.

Up to this point the story unwinds with great ingenuity. We, like Wilt, are gathering and weighing evidence, building up a picture of Sylvestre. We are also building up a picture of Wilt, crediting him with some highly imaginative inferences yet wondering whether they may not be too imaginative, whether his drink-disordered brain and novelist's cleverness can be trusted. At this point, however, when suspense and curiosity have been exploited for all they are worth, the story must either conclude on a teasing lady-or-the-tiger note, or take a further turn. What one looks forward to is a meeting between Wilt and Sylvestre which, without being too pat a give-away, would yet give us, by some clue, a sure sense of the truth. But Miss Boyle goes at the matter much more bluntly: she abruptly ends the book with a newspaper announcement concerning Sylvestre which seems out of key with the psychological method by which the rest of the story has been built up. This piece of editorializing is on a par with the conventional wind-up of a detective story, whereas the whole charm of "Monday Night" is that it is not a matter of absolute knowledge but a case of circumstantial evidence. A Henry James, manipulating his testimony, weaving his ambiguous motivations, juggling his personalities, would never have betrayed his situation with a banal exposure; and James might well be considered a model for such a story as "Monday Night."

Miss Boyle's blunder seems to me unfortunate, for, though her book is so pitched as not to be capable of more than a certain level of achievement, it might have been perfect of its kind. It is full of astute touches and sly descriptions and it seems to me a step forward from the often too delicate and attenuated studies in sensibility which Miss Boyle has written in the past. Wilt in particular, with his physical filth, his personal demoralization, his erratic night-mind, is brilliantly realized: to have chosen to probe a more conventionally baffling person like Sylvestre through a person like Wilt was an inspired idea. But once having pinned her faith on Wilt, Miss Boyle ought not have wavered and sent herself in to pinch-hit for him.

Miss Boyle is torn, in "Monday Night," between a literary and a colloquial style; the latter is newer with her and, I think, better; the former sometimes achieves strong and even beautiful effects, but shows too little restraint and has some of Faulkner's and Wolfe's tendency to overwrite. Occasionally, too, Miss Boyle fails to subsist within the limits of the English language: "buttons missing since a long time" is, I suppose, the price one must pay for living since a long time in Paris.

LOUIS KRONENBERGER

The Hidden Stream

FURTHER LETTERS OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS, INCLUDING HIS CORRESPONDENCE WITH COVENTRY PATMORE. Edited with Notes and an Introduction by Claude Colleer Abbott. Oxford University Press. $6.

"IT has always seemed to me that poetry is unprofessional," Hopkins wrote when he was twenty. Because he held, throughout his life, to the practice of his belief, his prose works come to the modern reader singularly pure: in the form of letters to intimate friends and notebooks. The present collection, under the same reverent editorship of Professor Abbott, contains "all further letters which have come to light" since 1935, when Hopkins's letters to Bridges and the Hopkins-Dixon correspondence appeared. The Notebooks, edited by Humphrey House, were published in 1937. The letters in this volume are divided into three sections: miscellaneous letters to family and friends; a long-continued (1863-1888) series of letters to A. W. M. Baillie; and, at last, the Hopkins-Patmore correspondence in full.

Casual letters are at once a touchstone and a give-away. They are certain to show all the cheapness and attitudinizing of a writer; rant, seedy thinking, sentiment, and obstinate prejudices come to the surface in such documents to be seen with great clearness. In the case of Hopkins, his letters prove, as his editor says, that the man was all of a piece; the letters "bear the imprint of the same rare mind and spirit, they have the same disciplined honesty and intensity of conviction" as the poems. So there is now disclosed to us for the first time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hidden stream of scholarly discussion which ran steadily beneath the public literary scene of the '70's and '80's. And here are the simply expressed but profound and hard-bitten conclusions reached by a man who had shut himself away from life—a man who feared his own nature, and, admitting his fear, took every precaution that that nature should not function freely.

Hopkins's remarkable scholastic record has not been fully emphasized. He was a prize pupil of Jowett's at Balliol, a fact which his superiors in the Jesuit order took into account when they appointed him lecturer and examiner in Greek to the University College in Dublin. His interest in metrics never flagged, and his technical theories, as well as his technical practice, have opened, and will continue to open, new doors into poetic richness and freedom. Even more impressive, in these letters, than his scholarship are his unfailing curiosity and poetic insight. He was a man "for whom the visible world triumphantly existed." His eye microscopically took in every detail of the objects upon which he fixed his attention. His love for appearance was so great that the worst penance he could impose upon himself was to turn his eyes away from nature. His ear, sharp and interested, picked up turns of speech peculiar to a countryside. He was excited by ecclesiastical architecture no more than by the architecture of swallows.

In the field of the arts his musical interest ranged from Purcell to Wagner (about whose works, since he had no opportunity to hear them, he desired detailed accounts). His remarks on painting are often profound ("I have *invented* a Canaletto with genius: his name is Guardi"). And his critical insight into literature flashes out in a comparison, anticipating many like comparisons made in recent years, between what Keats might have lived to be with what Shakespeare was. And again, his ideas about the "overthought and underthought" in Greek tragic poets ("underthought conveyed by choice of metaphors, etc., and only half-realized by the poet himself") foreshadow recent ideas of scholars concerning the underlying symbolism in Shakespeare's plays.

Baillie was not a poet, but his learning and sensitiveness and his interest in what Hopkins had to say often brought, from Hopkins, a full rush of explanation and exposition. Hopkins's theories concerning the kinds of poetry—an account which proves him to have been, at twenty, a critic of the first order—were sent to Baillie.

The Patmore correspondence, which occurred during the last six years of Hopkins's life, when he was thirty-nine and Patmore sixty, has been published in part elsewhere—in Basil Champneys's "Life of Patmore" and by Father Lahey in his "Life of Hopkins." Champneys hesitated to publish the letters in full, on the ground that they were too technical for the general reader. Patmore during this time was preparing the revised (third collected) edition of his Poetical Works (1887). Patmore's reputation had gone into eclipse. "The Angel in the House," a generation earlier, had been second only to Tennyson's poems in popularity. Since Hopkins had expressed his admiration for the later Odes—attracted by the free form and intense emotion in them—Patmore asked his advice on revisions. The younger man's comments, in every case, go straight to the heart of Patmore's basic faults of style and tone. Hopkins's respect for Patmore (who, like himself, was "curious and learned in prosody") kept him from delivering a criticism in the bald manner of Tennyson, who once said that some of Patmore's lines seemed to be hammered up out of old nails. But Hopkins not only points out Patmore's ambiguities, incomplete sense, and bad phrasing, but attacks his lack of true ear, frequent lack of taste, his affectation, insincerity, and Tory tub-thumping. Patmore took all this, it must be said, in good part. He saw, as might be expected, nothing but "strangeness" in Hopkins's poems. But he wrote to Bridges, after the death of Hopkins:

> . . . there was something in all his words and manners that was at once a rebuke and attraction to all who could only aspire to be like him. . . .

and added that Hopkins's genius was unmistakable.

These letters bring out, finally, the tormented plans—almost amounting to manias—of Hopkins's later years. His discussion, with Baillie, of the probable derivation of Greek words from Egyptian (which led nowhere) and his determination to write music show the beating about of a rich nature against the rigidity of the rule it worked under. Much sympathy has been poured out concerning the conflict between Hopkins's character and the severity of the Jesuit life. But where could this fiery spirit, these delicate sensibilities have fitted in the Victorian world, big as it was with ideas of optimism and progress, and punctuated as it was by the suicides of sensitive young men? "Great from the hard forming hand" Hopkins had chosen in youth "he triumphs, utterly defeated." Seen from our time, the design, the "instress," of Hopkins's life is so clear that it seems not only that life's best, but indeed its only possible, pattern.

LOUISE BOGAN

Trials on Trial

NOT GUILTY, Report of the Commission of Inquiry Into the Charges Against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials. Harper and Brothers. $2.75.

WE are living in a day in which the sneer of the man of power: "What is truth?" has achieved a new relevance. Truth has never been so completely in the service of power as today. Truth is what Dr. Goebbels manufactures in his propaganda ministry. Truth is what the Italian censor admits and what General Llano, recently canonized by Ellery Sedgwick as "Saint of Andalusia," shouts forth from the radio station of Burgos. In such a day, in which plebiscites are used to kill democracy, it is not surprising that courts have become the instruments of obscuring justice. Everyone who has his face set toward the new day would like to believe that all this corruption is merely the characteristic of a dying civilization (fascism) and that the symbols and forces of the new day are free of it. But alas and alack! Power in the hands of the advancing forces, particularly power which is not under democratic control, seems to be the same source of corruption, whether on the right or the wrong side.

That is why the report of the commission of inquiry into the Moscow trials, under the chairmanship of Dr. John Dewey, is important and why, despite the diligent labors of the committee in the interest of truth, the report will be re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceived with incredulity and derision by all simple devotees of the cause which it supposedly imperils.

The commission has obviously pursued its task of inquiry with remarkable diligence. It gathered depositions and affidavits in the four corners of the world and held hearings in Mexico, New York, and France. Its report is roughly divided into two parts. One deals with the evidence which it adduced in refutation of specific accusations against Trotsky in the Moscow trials. The other analyzes the general credibility of the inclusive indictment of Trotsky as an instrument of capitalistic and fascist reaction.

The evidence adduced in the first part proves pretty conclusively: that Piatakov's visit to Trotsky via airplane could not have taken place; that Trotsky's son could not have been in Copenhagen; that relations between Trotsky's son and the German Nazis, including an alleged "kick-back" arrangement with German industrialists working on Russian orders, were highly improbable; that all the alleged meetings and letters between Trotsky and the defendants are subject to suspicion; that Trotsky's alleged relation to the Kirov murder is a very unconvincing indictment for many reasons, including the failure of the court to call eleven G. P. U. agents who were sentenced in 1935 to from two to ten years at hard labor because they "possessed information concerning preparations for the attempts on Kirov—and failed to take necessary measures"; that the indictment charging Trotsky with attempts on Stalin's life rests solely upon the prosecutor's misinterpretation of Trotsky's use of Lenin's phrase, "I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint another man"; that Trotsky has consistently followed the Marxian line of opposition to individual terrorism. In dealing with the charges of sabotage the commission took evidence from foreign experts, who had been active in Russian industry as advisers, tending to prove that the regime was using some of the defendants in the trial as scapegoats to hide the bureaucratic inefficiency of the leadership in some industries and that the scapegoats were frequently the men who sought to help the foreign experts in their attack upon the bureaucrats; and that the charges of "Trotskyism" against these foreign experts were wholly without foundation. The charges of agreements with foreign powers by the Trotskyites are proved to be very flimsy and to rest mainly upon the prosecutor's mutilation of an open letter by Trotsky to his adherents in Russia which begins with the words: "The immediate tactical task is to retreat from the position of adventurism."

The second part of the report is concerned to prove the inherent improbability of the whole charge against Trotsky as a fountain source of wrecking, terrorism, and treasonable activities. One chapter analyzes the charge of a "historical connection" between Trotsky's present treason and his early heresies. The prosecutor charged that: "In 1915 Trotsky came out in opposition to Lenin's doctrine of the possibility of victory of socialism in one country. Thus he completely capitulated to capitalism over twenty years ago." The report makes a careful comparison of Lenin's, Stalin's, and Trotsky's statements on the relation of revolution in one country to the necessity of a world revolution and comes to the obvious conclusion that Trotsky's position and Lenin's were essentially identical. They both believed in the importance of the initial victory in Russia but in the ultimate necessity of a world revolution. Stalin's present position may be more correct than either Lenin's or Trotsky's. The commission rightly disavows interest in that question but its analysis proves the incredibility of the charge of early treason.

It must be added that the report throws little light on just how much truth there is in the charges of the Moscow trials and by what method the defendants were caught in the toils of the G. P. U. It has a chapter upon the use of torture in Russia in securing confessions but comes to the conclusion that "it is impossible for any honest person, on the basis of records so full of contradictions and deliberate falsifications as the records of both trials, to come to any conclusions concerning their guilt or innocence of other charges or the nature of their crimes, if any."

There, probably, "any honest person" will have to let the matter rest until history discloses now hidden secrets. Dr. Dewey's commission meanwhile deserves a vote of gratitude for a task well done in the interest of truth. Some of us who regard Trotsky's political theories as fantastic, his messianic ego as pathetic, and his present political influence as confusing will be willing to be regarded as "Trotskyites" while we stand up for that vote. REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Political Almanac

OUR COUNTRY, OUR PEOPLE, AND THEIRS. By M. E. Tracy. The Macmillan Company. $1.75.

THE conception of this new political almanac is striking, but its execution is disappointing. Mr. Tracy is endeavoring to show that person for person and institution for institution life in the United States is incomparably better than in the three "dictatorship" countries—Germany, Italy, and Russia. The idea of contrasting American life—from steel production to medical facilities—with life in other countries undoubtedly offers the most effective means of making propaganda for our democracy, which is what Mr. Tracy is interested in doing. But after wading through his statistical Baedeker, it is doubtful that the lay reader for whom the book is intended will really understand how well off he is.

For Mr. Tracy's painstaking method has defeated his own end. What matters is not that the United States has so many million automobiles, while other countries have fewer. All that need be shown is that the United States has mastered the technique of mass production, for peaceful prosperity—and for war. A German—or an English—engineering shop can build tailor-made metal products which, for accuracy and strength, are superior to any metal products which can be made by hand in this country. But in terms of mass-production items the tables are turned. We don't make Rolls-Royces, but what is more important to John Smith and the infantry, *they* can't make Fords. Their economies are still operating on an artisan, instead of a mass-production, basis.

This is the reason why Mr. Tracy's three dictatorships make a false comparison with the United States. Presumably he has thrown Russia into the pot because of the free-speech situation. But for American foreign policy, the issue is economic, not social. And, on economic grounds, the comparison that should be made is not between the United States and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three dictatorships, but between the United States and the rest of the world. Mr. Tracy's thesis about the American standard of living certainly holds up in comparison to the rest of the world lumped together: you can add British and German margarine to Japanese seaweed, and you still don't get butter. And most important of all is a reason for contrasting the rest of the world with the United States, which Mr. Tracy does not consider. Democracies and dictatorships alike, the five continents over, are recognizing our enormous economic and technological superiority over them by coming here for our aid in their armament programs. If our economic power is to be used as a force for world peace, as Mr. Tracy desires, is it not fair to ask how far foreign armament schedules could be carried without American help? And this is why I object to his inclusion of Russia in the picture, for, free speech or no free speech, here is a point at which Russia stands on her own feet. What we should know is how far the real fascist axis, which includes Japan instead of Russia, and how far the embryonic Chamberlain-Hitler axis would get without economic assistance from America.

The illuminating chapters at the end on general social and cultural conditions are excellent, although they tell nothing new about the countries in question. On the other hand, the make-up of the book makes reading it an ordeal. Each page must be read four times, once for each country. If the book goes into a second edition, I hope the publishers print it in the ordinary way, keeping the pictorial graphs, but running the copy consecutively instead of in parallel columns.

ELIOT JANEWAY

HOW THE LORDS OF UNDERCOVER HORSE-RACE BETTING BUILT AND OPERATE

AMERICA'S BIGGEST CASH BUSINESS

Scot free of tax, immune from prosecution, organized on the best lines of Big Business, America's billion-dollar undercover betting industry has a story to tell that its "bigshots" don't want told. Heretofore shrouded in secrecy or dodged in surface-scratching glimpses, "POOLROOM" blows the lid off the whole amazing business. Here is an "inside" picture of the strong-arm control, the buccaneering ingenuity, the trickery, the political connivance and graft which perpetuate the huge monopoly. For the whole fascinating, timely, definitely authentic story, read—

POOLROOM

A TIMELY NOVEL BASED ON FACT

BY WILLIAM JOURDAN RAPP

$2 at bookstores

LEE FURMAN PUBLISHERS NEW YORK

Radio Rules the Waves

TELEVISION, A STRUGGLE FOR POWER. By Frank Waldrop and Joseph Borkin. William Morrow & Co. $2.75.

TO what uses should available radio frequencies be allocated? Who should be allowed to own or control those frequencies? What are the effects of the control of the means of mass communication by powerful financial interests, motivated by profits and self-preservation? What role should government play to encourage and improve the economical and socially desirable uses of the ethereal channels? These and other vital questions of public policy have until recently received little public expression and discussion. The reason for this neglect was, of course, the comparative novelty and the complexities of radio.

During the past two years the problems that beset radio broadcasting and other newer uses of wireless have become public issues. Resolutions in both houses of Congress have been pressed for an investigation of the radio industry. The one in the House even came to a vote, only to be killed in the last hectic days of the session. The Communications Commission has shown signs of belated awakening to the existence of serious defects in the present organization of the radio industry and in the allocation of wireless frequencies for different uses. And the press has become more and more conscious of the vital role of wireless communication in the political arena.

Joseph Borkin and Frank Waldrop render a public service in attempting to define some of these issues for the lay reader. Although the book is entitled "Television," the authors really cover a wide range of subjects dealing with many other uses of wireless. They raise many questions of national policy, but "the authors of this book propose no answer." Consequently, the reader has the pleasant experience of witnessing, as in a Translux theater, an exciting series of newsreels on radio history dramatized by an imaginative script.

It would be a mistake, however, to take the book as anything but journalism, because in many places it sacrifices accuracy to dramatic writing. The present reviewer is particularly touchy upon this point because the original sources cited for many of the facts badly garbled by the authors consist of reports which he wrote for the Telephone Investigation. A few of the misstatements will be pointed out here in the hope that the authors may reconsider them in any future revision of the book. For instance, the authors state (pp. 145-146) that former President Fish of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company "put the A. T. & T. in a dominant position though in so doing he threatened its whole existence." This statement is questionable. If anything, F. P. Fish left the company in 1907 in a storm of trouble, with tens of millions of bonds then issued remaining unsold, and the independent telephone companies, which reached their peak of strength in 1907, seriously challenging the supremacy of the Bell telephone system. Again the authors say (p. 146), "Under Fish's management it was determined that the Bell system's ownership should be sown, like oats before an October gale, across the fields of America." This is completely inaccurate; the widespread distribution of Bell system securities through-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the United States did not begin in earnest until 1922 when H. P. Thayer and W. S. Gifford had come into the leadership of the system.

The parenthetical remarks made by the authors for dramatic effect are often misleading, such as (p. 147) "For on Christmas Eve, 1906, even as the bankers were preparing for the new stock issue, etc."—a statement completely confused, as it was not a stock issue but a large convertible bond issue that the bankers were considering, and it was not on Christmas Eve, 1906, but during 1905 that the issuance of these bonds was discussed and determined upon, and they were not distributed "like oats before an October gale, across the fields of America," but the bankers actually were stuck with nearly one hundred and forty million dollars of these convertible bonds until nearly 1909.

Coming nearer home to the problem of radio, particularly the Radio Patent Pool, we find still more serious inaccuracies. The authors conclude (p. 197) that neither the R. C. A. nor the telephone company will license the other to use its patents for radio telephone communications with trains. This is not true, because the use of the patents of all parties to the Radio Pool in two-way *public service telephone communication* (wire and wireless) is a province of the telephone company, according to the cross-licensing agreements. Again, and this is vital to the theme of the book, the authors state (p. 198) "But broadcast television, the amusement, the public service in its own right, the great new frontier in industry, is assigned specifically to neither in the treaty." A careful reading of the 1926, as well as the 1932, cross-licensing agreements will show that so far as broadcasting of television by wireless is concerned, the use of the patents is given to R. C. A. On the other hand, when transmission over wires is involved, it is in the hands of the A. T. & T. Again, in discussing the relative positions of R. C. A. and Columbia Broadcasting Company with the telephone system, the authors state (pp. 221-222) that according to the provisions of the "treaty of 1932" R. C. A. stands favored and can use Bell system facilities for television programs, whereas Columbia's contract is more limited. It must be stated that the relations of R. C. A. (and N. B. C.) with the Bell system in the use of wires is regulated by the Service Agreement of 1926 and not the treaty of 1932. Some of these errors are minor, others are serious, since they affect the control of television in the future, a major problem in this book.

Perhaps it is a little pedantic to quarrel with such factual inaccuracies, because the book is useful not as a compendium of facts, not as a reference book on the history of communications, but as an attempt to popularize important issues of public policy which must be faced and resolved in the near future.

N. R. DANIELIAN

Sea Going

THE MAKING OF A SAILOR. By Alan J. Villiers. William Morrow and Company. $4.

THIS book might be described as a photographic companion to the "Cruise of the Conrad" by the same author. To leave it at that, however, would be to miss the spirit that guided the selection of the photographs and to forget the trenchant introduction. Villiers is interested in the sea and the training of seamen. Like many before him he feels that a sailing ship provides the best start for a nautical career. He points out that only the United States and England fail to supply this manner of training. He might also have added that most of the yachts and even small trading schooners in American service are manned by Scandinavians.

The book is made up of some two hundred excellent photographs of the "Joseph Conrad" under sail, with cadets doing the work. A few of the photographs are of the Danish training ship, the "Georg Stage." The selections are uniformly good, and even in today's camera-conscious world some are unique. They speak volumes for the discipline and team work that are necessary to run a big sailing ship successfully.

The Danish government does not operate the ship; it is supported entirely by contributions from shipowners and philanthropic Danish citizens. The small sum paid by the cadets is waived in some cases. American shipowners and millionaires who are tired of government interference might well find an outlet of great value in the founding of a schoolship in which young Americans might learn the fundamentals of seamanship.

HUGH H. DARBY

Back Files of *The Nation*—

For the convenience of subscribers who wish to buy or sell back files of the magazine, *The Nation* is prepared to act as an information agency.

Sellers please note: Copies offered for resale should be complete and in good condition. If files are not perfectly continuous, note of any omissions should be included in your decription. You may set a price for your whole set, or for sections of it by year or volume.

Whenever practicable, persons wishing to buy back files will be referred direct to those wishing to sell issues of the desired period.

The Nation
20 Vesey Street, : New York

GREEN MANSIONS
A Complete Modern Camp and Country Club in the Adirondacks
Clubhouse — Each Room With Private Bath
Private Golf Course on Premises
Champion Tennis Courts
And All Other Sports Facilities
Professional Theatre
Chamber Music
Booklet on Request
LENA BARISH SAM GARLEN
Directors
NEW YORK OFFICE
11 West 42nd Street
BRyant 9-1738

FOR SALE

Oranges—Limes for Sale. New crop oranges just ripe $4 bushel, $2 half bushel. Finest quality seedless limes $4 half bushel delivered prepaid. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Florida.

FURNISHED STUDIO

Exceptionally large, sunny; cross-ventilation; centrally located, unusually artistic surroundings; reasonable. SU 7-9880.

FOR RENT

Furnished apartment for rent. 2 charming rooms, large kitchen. Books, congenial surroundings; including electric, gas, $50 mo. H. C., Apt. 5W, 39 E. 10th St., N. Y. C.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING RATES:
62c a line (six words)
Minimum 3 lines
THE NATION
20 Vesey Street, N. Y. C. COrt. 7-3330

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

Tragic Odyssey

Dear Sirs: Girolamo Peduzzi, anti-fascist stone mason and coal miner, is on Ellis Island, in imminent danger of deportation. Peduzzi has been unable to return to Italy (where he had been a Socialist), since 1925, when the Italian consul in Cannes, France, denounced him for anti-fascist work. He participated in the great Cannes Sacco-Vanzetti demonstration in August, 1927. The French government deported him to Belgium, which redeported him for selling a Communist paper. He has also been barred from Luxemburg and sentenced *in absentia* by an Italian court to eighteen years' hard labor for having, on Communist Party orders in 1932, shot a pistol into the air to confuse fascist demonstrators at Esch.

Finally, Peduzzi has been deported from Russia; he fled there in 1933, worked on the new Lenin Library, joined the Communist Party, and was rewarded for his construction work with a private room. But because at the Italian Political Exiles Club in Moscow he criticized what he thought unfair inequalities of living standards, he was expelled from the Communist Party and, in 1937, put into Lubianka Prison. He testifies that efforts were made to make him confess, by means of tricks, torture, and beatings, to being a "Trotskyist-anarchist-Bordigist organizer of bourgeois anti-Soviet agitation, terror, and intervention." He denied and still denies these charges. In January, 1938, he was dumped into Poland, possessed of an Italian passport and a few rags of clothing.

He made his way to Paris, entering France illegally. Fearing deportation to Italy, he stowed away on the steamship Washington, to wind up at Ellis Island asking asylum as a political refugee. He is represented by Isaac Shorr, an attorney who has handled many political and labor cases, and who entered this one after Peduzzi's record and character were vouched for by reliable persons in New York as well as by G. A. Modigliani, leader of the Italian Socialist Party in Paris, M. Abramovitch, the Russian Menshevik, and Henri Poulaille, French novelist.

Authority to admit Peduzzi permanently or for ninety days, during which he could arrange voluntary departure to a safe country, rests with the Secretary of Labor, who could base favorable action both on statute and on the President's declaration that his pro-refugee policy covers refugees from Italy and Russia as well as from Hitler's terror. Unless pressure is brought to bear on Secretary Perkins to reverse the deportation order, Peduzzi will be sent to France, where the police are likely to deliver him to Italy and eighteen years on the penal islands.

JAMES ONEAL, Editor, *New Leader*
CARLO TRESCA, Editor, *Il Martello*
New York, July 20

Harvard Needs Frankfurter

Dear Sirs: I disagree strongly with your editorial suggesting the appointment of Felix Frankfurter to the Supreme Court. Professor Frankfurter is too valuable in the Harvard Law School to be taken away. Hard as it will be to replace Justice Cardozo, it will be harder to replace Felix Frankfurter at Harvard. Socially important as the work of a Supreme Court Justice is, the work of a teacher of hundreds of law students is far more so. LUTON ACKERSON
Chicago, July 18

Dinner Manners

Dear Sirs: Leo Huberman's article, Insurance Agents Are Human, was very welcome to insurance agents. They are really putting up a heroic fight against fabulously wealthy corporations.

Recently the Metropolitan Insurance Company held a dinner for its agents in New Jersey. For the first time in the history of the company they subdivided the territory into small groups. Each man wore a badge with a different colored ribbon. On the badge was the agent's name and debit number. Officials of the company had a book listing the men's names and their relation to the C. I. O. The executives invited questions (good old espionage) but the men were too scared for the most part to ask any. When one of them did venture to ask why the Metropolitan does not recognize the union, since the Supreme Court has ruled on the constitutionality of the NLRB, and since accountants, newspaper men, engineers, government and civil service employees, teachers, college professors, etc., belong to unions, Leroy A. Lincoln, president of the Metropolitan, hemmed and hawed and stalked out of the room. Later, Mr. Wilkes, vice president of the company, spoke at length about an insignificant minority which had migrated from foreign countries and was trying to upset our American way. He neglected to state that he himself is an immigrant from good old England.

It may be worth noting that in the brief filed in the New York Supreme Court by the Metropolitan in its fight against the union, the company's counsel, Samuel Seabury, quotes at length from Stalin and Lenin in his attempt to tie the Wagner Act and the New York State labor act with the Soviet system.

INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE AGENT
New York City, July 19

CONTRIBUTORS

LOUIS FISCHER is *The Nation's* correspondent in Spain.

F. B. WARREN is a former New York newspaper man.

LOUIS KRONENBERGER is dramatic editor of *Time.*

LOUISE BOGAN, poetry critic of the *New Yorker,* is the author of a book of verse, "The Sleeping Fury."

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, professor of applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary, is the author of "Reflections on the End of an Era."

ELIOT JANEWAY contributes a weekly financial column to the Federated Press.

N. R. DANIELIAN is on the staff of the Federal Communications Commission.

HUGH H. DARBY is an associate in the Department of Biological Chemistry at the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS
THE NATION, 20 Vesey St., New York. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, 50 cents. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Three weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED